# UNITY

*FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION*


The Role of America in World Affairs - - - - - - - - *Curtis W. Reese*

Why Permit Strikes? - - - - - - - - - - - - *O. A. Hammand*

One Community - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *John Collier*

Up-to-Date Religion in a World Behind the Times - - - - - - *Dale DeWitt*

Factories and the Church - - - - - - - - - - - - *Edmund A. Opitz*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS



VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 5

Chicago, July, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

# UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

*Published Monthly*
*Until Further Notice*

*Subscription $1.50*
*Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

*"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."*

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*


## Contributors

*John Collier:* Former Commissioner of Indian Affairs and now President of the Institute of Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D. C.; also Editor of the Institute's *Newsletter.*

*Dale DeWitt:* Regional Director for the American Unitarian Association in the Middle Atlantic States.

*O. A. Hammand:* Attorney and President of Iowa Authors Club.

*C. A. Hawley:* Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchinson, Kansas.

*Delos O'Brian:* Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Berkeley, California.

*Edmund A. Opitz:* Unitarian Minister, recently returned from India, where he served with the American Red Cross.

*Kenneth L. Patton:* Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

*James M. Yard:* Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

## *Contents*


EDITORIAL—
The Role of America in World Affairs—CURTIS W. REESE..... 67

ARTICLES—
Why Permit Strikes?—O. A. HAMMAND..... 70
One Community—JOHN COLLIER..... 71
Up-to-Date Religion in a World Behind the Times—DALE DEWITT ..... 72
Factories and the Church—EDMUND A. OPITZ..... 74

POETRY—
Where Is God?—LEE SPENCER..... 71

THE STUDY TABLE—
One Girl Helps Make a United America—DELOS O'BRIAN..... 76
A Weighty Pamphlet—JAMES M. YARD..... 77
"The Pathway to a New World"—C. A. HAWLEY..... 77
State of Poetry—KENNETH L. PATTON..... 77

CORRESPONDENCE—
No Longer a Man's World—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH..... 78
That Alleged Indeterminacy "Principle"—VICTOR S. YARROS.... 78
Replying to Mr. Chworowsky—MIRIAM ZIONY..... 79

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS..... 80

THE FIELD—
Preaching—*The Churchman* ..... 66


## The Field

*"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."*

### Preaching

Speaking on the importance of preaching, at a dinner given by *The Churchman* at the Biltmore Hotel, New York, June 12, Dr. G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, declared:

> We must not allow religion to be used by clever beneficiaries of inequality, who seek to label sound reforms by terms calculated to discredit reforms and thereby retain the injustices of the status quo. These injustices are, in fact, special privileges of the beneficiaries of things as they are.

Bishop Oxnam spoke in support of the Sermon of the Year plan, recently inaugurated by *The Churchman,* which will give prizes of $1,000, $500, and $250 for the three best sermons preached each year on subjects dealing with the betterment of social relations. The project was inspired by *The Churchman Award,* given annually "for the promotion of good will and better understanding among all peoples."

Bishop Oxnam took strong issue with those laymen who would have the pulpit used for support of special privilege. Condemning the loose use of labels, he said:

> It was but yesterday that the privileged of feudalism used the term "Republican" to discredit the march toward democracy. The king who could say, "I am the State" saw in the Republican, who believed that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, a man who was not a reformer but a revolutionist. The term "Bolshevik" was used not alone to describe the revolutionary movement in Russia but to discredit the right of labor to organize, the duty of the people to provide for old age or to abolish child labor.

Referring to the term "social planning" and Professor Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom,* "wherein it is assumed that the plan is to enslave," Dr. Oxnam asserted that certain sections of the community "saw in the argument of the book propaganda to maintain things as they are by discrediting the social planning that may be necessary to create things as they ought to be." He continued:

> That some forms of social planning do enslave cannot be denied. That all social planning imprisons is false. Men who scoff at the possibility of full employment and cry for the return of the conditions that led to the unemployment and panic of 1929 unwittingly perhaps become the creators of revolution. Equality of consideration does not imply identity of treatment. It does insist upon equal opportunity for all. We can plan for such equal opportunity expressed in such equal rights as the right to be well-born, the right to a home, the right to an education, the right to work. There is, of course, a

(*Continued on page 77*)

# UNITY

Volume CXXXII JULY, 1946 No. 5

## The Role of America in World Affairs

CURTIS W. REESE

From earliest times, from crude beginnings, and with great difficulty the human race has struggled forward toward ordered society. Trial and error has produced a variety of social forms, some of which have been steps to further development, while others have blocked the way to further progress. This effort of mankind toward ordered society has produced clans, tribes, and nations; we have now reached the point where we have caught the vision of a world society.

The problem to which we should now direct attention is: What part shall America play in the further development of ordered society on a world scale? It is not too much to say that the high point so far in the history of man's effort to order his way under law for the good of the people is found in the establishment and development of the United States of America, where there has been accomplished in a relatively brief period more freedom of spirit and a greater quantity of physical goods than has been the case elsewhere with any other society in any length of time. This fortunate fact places America in a position where her influence and her resources can determine the future course of world events. Positive action on our part can determine what road the world shall travel; and indecision on our part will likewise determine what road the world shall travel.

In centering attention upon America I am explicitly concerned not only for the future of America but also for the future of the world—for all peoples everywhere. Never before has a nation had such grave responsibility, for never before has a nation possessed such power to determine the course of human events.

Among the various roads that it appears possible for America to choose perhaps there is none more tempting, yet hazardous, than that of isolation. How easy it is to play the role of the hermit and to say that Europe and Asia and Africa are none of our business; that we should not go about sticking our nose into the affairs of other people; and that we have plenty to do at home.

Ten years of depression and five years of war have demonstrated anew how certainly we are geared into the economy and the politics of the world. There was a time when we talked of the Atlantic and the Pacific as guaranties against invasion; but this now sounds like irresponsible muttering, when we think of planes flying at 600 miles an hour and capable of carrying enough atomic bombs to vaporize Washington City or convert it into a molten mass. Isolation is no longer possible except as a short-cut to oblivion. It is self-evident that America can be safe, peaceful, and prosperous only as the world is made safe, peaceful, and prosperous. To think otherwise is to be as unrealistic as a hermit in a cave or a Bushman in a jungle. There is no insulation that can protect isolation from the explosions of the world.

We could travel the road that would lead us straight to the lair of the British Lion, where we could assume the role of chief groom to that much maligned king of the international forests. Our own history predisposes us toward this way; for until recently we have depended upon Great Britain for sea protection and there has been an unwritten law of mutual support. We have so much in common in culture and commerce, and in ideology, that I should not like to think that our ways would ever part. But it is one thing to feel bonds of enduring friendship and it is quite another to form our purposes to fit British policy. We have now come of age, and we must make our own purposes and policies. The purposes and policies that we shall make, however, will grow inevitably out of a history enriched by the soil of British thought and life; and it is reasonable to suppose that if our policies are unselfishly and grandly democratic we can depend on the best elements of British thought and life to be with us and not against us.

What I am urging is a reversal of the traditional role wherein we followed the British lead in international affairs. Henceforth our policy in international affairs should be independent in the sense that it is not formulated to fit British policy. But it should fit the democratic aspirations of the great mass of peoples in the far-flung British Commonwealth of Nations—aspirations that are common to freedom-loving peoples everywhere. We do not want ever to be anti-British, but always pro-humanity. We want neither Anglophobia nor Anglophilia. We want the full cooperation of Great Britain with all of her mighty power and determination in the building of the kind of world in which it is possible for democracy to grow and thrive and expand. We want American policy oriented, however, not toward British policy, but toward world policy.

We could become the center of opposition to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, and so play the role of chief tantalizer of the Russian Bear. There are those both at home and abroad who would like to see us follow precisely this course; but fortunately there are others who are more far-seeing and who want these two great centers of power to work out their differences amicably. Relations between Russia and the United States are of the greatest importance for the peace of the world. But there should be no misunderstanding on the part of Russia or the rest of the world regarding our determination to maintain on a world scale the fundamentals of democracy—freedom of thought, of speech, of press, of assembly, and of person,—without which no form of society can possess enduring values. Similarly, we should understand Russia's determination to push for the spread of the essentials of economic security—without which no form of society should endure. Common understanding of fundamental purposes should save these two powers from engaging in "name calling" and in bickering. Our strength is such that we can be gentlemanly even when we are firm. By the development of social democracy in America and of democratic Socialism in Russia, conflict between these two great centers of power can be avoided. And our surest guaranty of world leadership in any rivalry with Russia will be found in our zeal for the maintenance of basic liberty and the extension of basic security.

We could choose to become the world's greatest juggler in international affairs. We could continue as the holder of the balance of power in world affairs. We could play off one nation against another in such a way as to keep the nations guessing—and trembling while they guess. Most great world powers have followed precisely this course. It is the way of traditional diplomacy. But it is not the way of a great power that possesses principles and knows how to increase its power by loyalty to principles. Playing for the balance of power may be amusing to diplomats, and interesting to politicians, but it should be beneath the dignity of a great democracy that possesses the power to make its principles work without regard to alliances, which at best are of a temporary nature. Playing for the balance of power is a sign of weakness, not of strength.

There is a road which our history dictates and our future demands, viz., that of master builder of world-wide democracy. This way means opposing any power, or combination of powers, that stands in the way of the development of democracy on a world scale. It means using and developing all the power necessary to the attainment of world democracy. It means expanding national patriotism into world patriotism. Loyalty to home and fireside is basic and must not be given up; but we must come to realize that the only ultimate protection of national good is in the establishment of a world order, and that the only sure way to develop national good is within the framework of a world structure.

This is the road that our history indicates and that the needs of the world require. This road will not please the isolationists. It will not please either the Anglophobes nor the Anglophiles. It will distress both the pro-Russians and the anti-Russians, and it will dismay the old-line diplomats. But it is the road on which to rally all who believe in the future of free men in a free world.

Let us now consider what are the conditions of success in this role of master builder of world democracy to which by the nature of her beliefs and the volume of her power, America is obviously called.

First of all, we must resolve our internal dilemmas in accord with the ideals of our world purpose. When we set ourselves up as the master builder of world democracy—and it is my fundamental thesis that we can, should, and will do this—we must be especially concerned to see to it that our inner life corresponds to our professed and projected goals. I am not saying that we should suspend action on the world scene until we shall have fully cleansed our domestic scenes from narrowness and bigotry, from poverty and corruption, and from egotism and self-seeking. What I am saying is that we must be constantly aware of our shortcomings and work diligently to overcome them.

Among the dilemmas in our domestic scene which embarrass and hamper us in our action on the world scene, three stand out most prominently, viz., racial bigotry, economic insecurity, and ill health. There is no doubt but that in our better selves we believe in equality. We have proclaimed this doctrine to the world. We have been shocked when the principle of equality has been violated by other peoples. Yet at the same time we have practiced the most scandalous discrimination in practically all areas of our domestic life—from ballot boxes to capitols of government, and from home firesides to the altars of God. All of this is too obvious for any one to deny. What we need to do is to really take democracy seriously in our personal and social and civic life. This we must do if we are to maintain our moral as well as our political leadership in world affairs. Indeed, the moral quality of our political leadership will be of prime importance when we take our stand in behalf of freedom and equality of people in other parts of the world. We must stand before the world with a clear conscience when we say liberty, equality, and fraternity.

Similarly, we are embarrassed and hampered in our international leadership by the lack of economic well-being in the face of our unprecedented capacity to produce and distribute the goods that modern men must have for a full life. In this land of possible abundance there should be no need for anyone to suffer for the lack of physical goods—even when helping to supply the needs of other lands.

It is likewise in the field of health. Disease should not be rampant in a land where science can divest the atom of its hidden power. There is no excuse for the existence in America of a situation where a quarter of our manpower in their most vigorous years cannot meet even the moderate physical standards of military life. Superstition and vested interests must not be allowed to keep from the people the preventive and the curative services that are abundantly possible. We must be strong at home if we would be mighty abroad.

Being morally and physically strong, and having the spiritual strength that comes from the consciousness of inner rectitude, we must, as a second condition of fulfilling our world destiny, maintain such physical strength on the land, on the sea, and in the air that no power and no combination of powers can successfully challenge us in our role as master builder of world democracy.

Our civilian-mindedness is one of our precious heritages; and I am not suggesting that we become militarily-minded. What I am maintaining is that the best of good intentions are helpless in the face of overpowering and hostile force. There is no valid moral distinction between soul force and physical force, as such. Both can be tyrannous and vicious; and both can bring release and freedom. Persuasion, suggestion, and example—the conventional methods of soul force—can be as debilitating and deadening to a people as bullets and bombs.

I do not pretend to know the relative worth of the various possible means of defense and of strategy. I am merely asserting that if America becomes physically weak, democracy's first great hope will have become her last hope. It came near being so in recent years. That danger we must never risk again. When we say "democracy" we must mean it, and the world must know that we have the power to make our meaning real.

Another condition of positive achievement in our larger role as the builder of a wider democracy is that we must free ourselves from the fear of distant places, and from the fear of words.

It would appear that a country possessing such wide-reaching plains and such towering mountains would have no fear of far places. But such has not been the case. Even two world wars, when our forces were scattered over the face of the globe, have not made us feel at ease when we contemplate the far-away. True, we know that we can speak around the world instantly and that we can circle the globe in a matter of hours. Yet great masses of our people, led by a powerful press and agitated by demagogic nativists, are provincial when not still parochial. Such phobia must be rooted out by an analysis that will show the most neurotic isolationist that this is in fact one world and that there are no far places.

Similarly, we must free ourselves from the fear of words. "Expansion," "imperialism," and "domination" are examples of what I mean. We have feared to establish bases in distant places lest we be charged with expansionism. We have feared to become the protector of endangered peoples lest somebody cry out "imperialism." We have feared to insist on democratic rights in international concerns lest we be charged with attempting "domination." These are words that we should no longer fear. If bases in the Pacific be expansion, so be it. If protecting the Chinese from inner dissension and exterior aggression be "imperialism," let it be so. If seeing to it that incipient Fascism is plucked up by the roots wherever it appears be "domination," then by all means let us "dominate"!

To make sure that our power in world affairs is wisely used, that we do not inadvertently defeat our own purposes, we must educate for effective administration for democratic ends. We cannot afford to have our flag carried to other lands and then be dishonored at the hands of our own administration. We have made a beginning in the direction of training competent administrators. But there are far too many men representing America on foreign soil who do not know what democracy really means and who are not educated in the larger appreciation of other cultures and who, therefore, cannot make effective contacts for democratic purposes. A permanent part of our policy at home in behalf of our world policy should be the education and the discipline of our finest minds in the knowledge of world affairs and in the principles of effective administration to equip them for careers in democratic world statesmanship. What we have recently done in short courses to train for administration in occupied lands is commendable and it should be extended.

A final change in policy that we must effect if we are to lead grandly in the reshaping of the world is that of taking seriously democratic forces elsewhere. We must become willing to take into full partnership the democratically enlightened in all corners of the globe. In the countries that have come under our control in recent months and years we have too often given aid and comfort to our natural enemies and disdained the cooperation of our natural friends. We must have a definite policy of seeking out the friends of democratic ways and making them feel at home in our counsels. We should give to them places of responsible leadership, and assure them of the full backing of our influence and our might. This we should not limit to individuals and groups. We should also include those countries, both small and large, that want to become a part of the world democratic front. Our backing for such persons and peoples must not be subject to the accidents of our domestic politics but must be such an integral part of our international policy that no change of administration at home would affect our administration abroad. I am not advocating a colonial

policy. I mean that we must give full partnership to persons and countries that are going our way. And I mean organic relationship when such is desired and feasible.

I see no good reason why a state of the United States must necessarily be on the soil of North America. There seems to me to be no reason why under proper conditions and circumstances democratic countries anywhere should not become an organic part of the United States if they desire such union. Particularly do I think this idea should apply and at once to Hawaii, and in the past it should have applied to the Philippines. It might well apply to other regions as our world policy proceeds. What I am suggesting might be called a specialized application of the theory of Union Now. Should such a process continue, under various governmental arrangements and devices, until the U. S. of A. becomes a U. S. of the World, it would be only a logical development of the thesis that our kind of democracy can continue to exist and develop in America only in case men take the initiative in finding the kind of world in which our kind of democracy can be at home. If we are to maintain citizenship in democratic America, we must become citizens of a democratic world.

It may be said that I am calling America to a role for which she is not equal either spiritually or physically. Let it be granted that we fall far short of the ideal; and that there are hazards both for ourselves and the world in the assumption of such a role as I have suggested. Even so, it is a role that we avoid at our peril. We do not want to depend upon atomic bombs to keep an anti-democratic world from our shores—a world that would also be equipped with atomic bombs. We must build a world in which we and all mankind can be free and peaceful and happy; a world where human personality is respected, and where the good things of life are available for everyone. We must pluck from our very inner life every trace of bigotry, of injustice, of self-seeking that would deter us from full commitment to the gigantic task before us.

When our founding fathers committed this country to the maintenance of inalienable rights, to the free exercise of free minds, and to the promotion of the common good, they let loose a force on this planet that cannot be stopped and that should not be stopped until men of all races and climes shall have come into their full heritage of liberty under law on a scale embracing the world.

---

# Why Permit Strikes?

O. A. HAMMAND

President Truman in his veto of the Case Bill stated that the purpose of the law should be to prevent strikes or to limit the extent of strikes. That is a very strange philosophy, though perhaps it is the prevailing philosophy. There are lots of things that could be done which would prevent strikes and would also prevent other things. They might prevent all production as well as strikes and they might also prevent all liberty.

The fatal point in said philosophy is that it ignores the idea of justice. The most important thing is to find a way to determine justice and then make that way clear to both of the contending sides and to the public itself. Until we have approximate justice and a way to attain it, human beings will just naturally use their most powerful instrument to obtain their ends.

And now we are beginning to play around with a new philosophy. We are about to transform an economic philosophy into a social philosophy. From all sides we hear the clamor that somebody should do this or should not do that—it is against the public interest. What do we mean by public interest? Do we mean their own personal interest and the interest of others in their class? Do they recognize the obligation of the other fellow to them, and if so do they recognize their obligation to the other fellow? If there is a public interest there is also a mutual interest. When we reach this point we are getting somewhere. For we must recognize that the other fellow has rights before there is any chance that he will get his rights or that we will get ours.

In one case a corporation stated that it could not afford to pay certain increases in wages. But the men asked, "Why?" The answer was that "we cannot and that settles it." The men said, "show us your books" but the company replied that "they are our books and not yours, and it is none of your business what they show or how much we make."

Now let us look at the subject quietly. If we live in a dog-eat-dog society with nobody under any obligation to anybody else, then that is one thing and we agree that nobody else has a right to see the books. But if we begin to ask that strikes be controlled or prevented or that men be sent into the army or put in jail because they refuse to work at a certain wage and make all of this clamor about public interest, we have changed our philosophy from an economic problem to a social problem. The question is now a fair sharing of the products of labor and industry among the people who produce those products and in order to know what that share should be we must go to the books to find out. Unless we are willing to go the whole way and concede the other fellow what the books show is due him, it is time to stop all of this nonsense about public interest.

# One Community*

JOHN COLLIER

We are meeting at a somber time. It may be the most somber hour that our world as a whole has ever known.

From famine to the deadlock of the peace settlements, to the embittered cry for freedom and for opportunity which comes daily from the colonial world, to the silent yet accelerated destruction of the world's resources, stored over a billion years, to the race of atom-bomb armament; from the re-arising hate in the breasts of people and of peoples to the failure of great leadership in the nations; it is the down-drag to the gulf that we are experiencing. I speak only what is in the mind of all of us here and afar.

The organizations which are holding this meeting, the Institute of Ethnic Affairs and the Institute of Pacific Relations, know how somber the hour is. But they believe that there is no fatality in the nature of things—not even in the nature of men.

They believe, knowing the profundity and also the complexity of the crisis into which our world has drifted, that there is knowledge enough to meet the crisis, and virtue enough. They know that here, and in lands all around the world, there are ample, even boundless, resources of common sense, of good will, and of intellectual and spiritual energy. The supreme problem, the solution of which would solve all else and would master our crisis, and make of the crisis the means to salvation—the master problem is to unloose those resources, which would be enough, of common sense, of good will, and of intellectual and spiritual energy, which are great and strong among the plain people of every nation, every dependency, even every local community.

I know the thought which will respond to this proposition in nearly every mind here tonight. Yes, we will all say, there does lie latent in men the virtue and the greatness to meet and master our world's crisis. And great challenges do evoke great responses. But *there is no time;* the drift to the chasm has become too swift; panic is seizing the world; and fear and cynicism and hate are poisoning too many souls. And while the collective actions which would be decisive are not many actions but few, and are not too difficult for intellectual projection, yet the *mechanisms* which we possess for political decision and action, the mechanisms for social decision and action, are indescribably imperfect, baffling to intelligence and will, are in fact obsolescent. It is not only the will to intelligent action within our crisis which has to be evoked, in millions of men and women. It is the mechanisms for action, the institutions for social and political action, which have to be constructed or remade. And for this, within the dissolution which moves so fast, there is no time.

It is because this thought is deep in many minds, and also because it is true, that I state it now. The mechanisms for community and national and world action are enormously deficient. And the wrong-headedness in people is stubborn and is compulsively disposed to speak and act. And the complex crisis of the world rushes on. The sands are nearly run out. Therefore within our souls there takes form the death-wish which too much frustration of necessary action brings in its train. We give up that larger hope, that world hope which now has become the only hope; we retreat to those things which our situation and the available social mechanisms make easily possible. There is not time to build that road on which mankind would move to lasting, living peace.

I shall try to give in a few words the answer which the two organizations sponsoring this meeting would give to the frame of mind I have described and to the wholly objective reality which causes the frame of mind.

We do not really know that only a little time remains before these events fulfill themselves which will engulf us. The best informed prophet cannot predict with definiteness or certainty what next year's events will be, still less what the next ten years' events will be. And the statement which William James often made is utterly true: not the assurance of success, but the mere chance of success—even the one chance in a thousand—is enough to nerve the wills of men for the most strenuous, sustained endeavor. Let it be so with our wills now.

I continue the answer which these two organizations give by implication in their programs of work. The informed thinking of the greatest number of people, in the greatest number of home communities, united with such action as is possible—practical action, even though not on the scale of the crisis which is upon us: such thinking and acting upon the subject of living peace, global and local in one: thinking fed with concrete data and feasible action programs, and involving above all the childhood and adolescent generation: this, be our time long or short, is the world's need and hope, and our homes' need and hope. Beyond all our frustrating mechanisms is the mind of man. The shaping of that mind, by its own activity, until it knows that the home community and the world community are one, and is affirmatively the brother of all races, the nourisher of the resources of all lands: this is the possible task, and in it every increment lives on and broadens from man to man. It is the task called for by a world hunger deeper than the hunger for food. It is the task which, if it can be achieved on a world scale, will master the crisis and change the prospect from death to life. It will give us the time we need.

*Opening remarks at the Institute of Ethnic Affairs, Washington, D. C., May 29, 1946.

---

### Where Is God?

God is within mankind or he is nowhere;
He cannot manifest except through man.
If man refuses to express the good
There is no good, no God, not anywhere,
For nature is a hard, impersonal force,
Which man can conquer with the power within.
God is where he evermore has been.
Seek him within the human soul alone.

LEE SPENCER.

# Up-to-Date Religion in a World Behind the Times

DALE DeWITT

Many people today do not know whether they are living in the past, the present, or the future. In a very real sense they are living in all three ages. This may sound strange but a little thought will indicate its truth.

There is a rather cumbersome heritage which has been preserved in books, old cultural patterns, customs, habits, and institutions. We use them in our living and sometimes it almost seems that we are engulfed by them. There is no way of escaping the past and much of it is with us permanently.

We live in the present by necessity because it surrounds us with problems, duties, and opportunities. We must work to live; we must read the papers or be lost in events. We must travel and in thousands of ways carry out our daily life. The present we must accept, just as we accept the universe.

But today we also feel that we are living in the future. This feeling has been accentuated by the discovery of the energy of the universe. One of the scientists responsible for this discovery has stated that we may be advanced three hundred years by it. About two years ago the President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science gave an address which in its descriptions of inventions already in use for war purposes rivaled an H. G. Wells' description of things to come. But even some of the scientists have been fooled about the speed with which things have come to pass. Dr. Irving Langmuir was reminded recently of a conversation with some of his friends at the close of the first World War. Someone had then spoken of the possibility of the destruction of mankind through the discovery of new, powerful weapons. Dr. Langmuir had said he thought this most unlikely since we were a long way yet from discovering even how to destroy insects. The recent reminder of this conversation brought from him the comment: "But, of course, since then we have learned a great deal about destroying insects."

Altogether, the future has rushed upon us to such an extent that we seem to be living in it whether we are or not. And one strongly suspects that we had better begin living in the future ahead of time if we expect to be able to control it when it comes.

Individually, people live in the past, present, and future in varying degrees. Many are not decided in which age they wish to live. Most people live to an unfortunately great degree in the past. If a line were drawn roughly across history now, I believe it would indicate that most of our world is behind the times. This is particularly true with reference to activities and attitudes. Our activities and attitudes have not caught up with our knowledge or our readily possible achievements. Let me point out some of the evident situations in which this is true.

H. G. Wells used to speak of the race between education and catastrophe. Well, it looks as if catastrophe always wins. With all its achievements, education is still behind the times. Poorly financed, tied to tradition, built upon ancient curricula, and afraid of experiment, education limps along when it should be one of the most extensive and progressive features of a modern civilization. Only a few public schools in better communities have ventured into social studies and many people are complaining even about this. Our great educators are aware of our needs in this direction, and Dr. James B. Conant, of Harvard, speaking of the social emphasis has said:

> To forward such ideals is surely the duty and privilege of our schools and colleges. I urge you then to set your eyes ahead—ahead to the time when our institutions may teach the arts, the sciences, and the letters with a full understanding of their interrelations and their social implications for the days of peace to come.

Education should not be routine learning, but should aim to build truth and enlarged understanding. Our educational systems are not yet fully equipped to achieve these aims, nor are we facing the many other opportunities of education in our day.

Another activity in which we are behind the times is economics. We are still trying to operate an economy of scarcity in a world of easily possible plenty. The resources of the earth are incontrovertibly abundant, and science can now quickly teach us to multiply nature's own contribution to the life of man. In this scarcity program, business often deliberately operates to slow down the production of new and improved articles, such as motor cars, while trying to convince us by advertising that it is forward looking. We are sold shoddy goods for the sake of greater profits. Purely apart from the consideration of theoretical economic systems, the the plain fact is that the needs of men have not been met because we are behind the times in economic motives.

In our attitudes on human relations there are many ways in which we are behind the times. The majority of the world believes in inherent racial superiorities even though scientific studies quite convincingly tell us that it is the economic, social and cultural factors that determine racial levels.

Right now we are in the midst of uncertainties in international relations because we are thinking in terms of maintaining nationalistic sovereignties in a "one world" situation. We see the blocking of democracy for nationalist advantage at a time when the world can only be safe if democracy is greatly extended.

These are only suggestive of the many ways in which the world is behind the times. It is not simply a case of science being ahead of the rest of the world. It is our attitudes that are behind the times, as well as our use of knowledge. And it is, of course, our attitudes which determine our use of knowledge.

It is because attitudes are to such a great extent the key to progress and because religion is so fundamental to attitudes that I have decided to discuss up-to-date religion in a world behind the times.

If we examine the religious situation, it must be confessed that most of the religion of the world is also behind the times. Many religions are still primitive and even in the more enlightened nations Christianity uses a Biblical approach that was formulated long before we had any modern knowledge of the Bible. Indeed, the whole religious situation is a tragically antiquated one. I wonder how often we stop to think what we mean when we speak of Christianity. If one were to imagine this religion in quantitative terms, in the form of a pyramid, and wondered what part had made any significant adjustment to modern knowledge, it would probably be just a small piece sliced off at the top point. The vast quantity is revivalism, primitivism, fundamentalism, and superstition. A sociologist who has made a study of the gains of religious groups during the past

two years has stated that the great increase is among such backward groups. He further states that most of these groups are engaged in fostering ill will or hatred toward fellow men of different races or beliefs. Usually people are so generous toward religion that they do not wish to think about it critically, but when they do they soon realize that here, as elsewhere, the world is greatly behind the times.

I would not blame systems, or customs, or habits entirely for this situation. We are to blame as individuals. We are not sufficiently ready to change, or to pay the momentary cost of moving into a new age. What Professor William F. Ogburn used to call cultural lag is to a great extent the lag of people who are not ready to live as the times demand.

In this world, so much behind the times, there are some people who are up to date; there are some movements, some sections of the fields I have talked about, which are up to date. But a religion that is truly up to date has yet to be crystallized, yet to be fully formulated and made institutionally effective.

Now when guides to the future are so desperately necessary, I should like to emphasize what, to my mind, are important features of an up-to-date religion. I cannot expect complete agreement with my viewpoint, but I would offer it as a challenge to thought on the part of those who are sincerely seeking a religion for the present and the future.

By a religion up to date I mean a religion that is in harmony with modern knowledge, one that would stir and encourage people to live and grow into the life of their own day, and look to the future.

In the first place, it would seem to me such a religion must leave aside theological doctrines and for these substitute reverence and faith. I am not by this urging that we leave aside all concepts of God, but that we drop dogmas and doctrine. There is a creative spirit in the life of man and in nature, and there is an energy of the good abroad among us. With this we are familiar.

Toward this quality or aspect in life we can have reverence and in its value we can have faith. But this is simple, understandable, and quite different from what centuries of theology and doctrine have given us. There is still today a vast amount of hair-splitting and division, speculation and uncertainty in theology. Try reading some of the current books in this field and this will be evident. The centuries have given us no real progress, and theological doctrine remains a futile and sterile field. I have no wish to be irreverent or facetious, but there is considerable truth that comes home, better, probably, for being lightly expressed, in these lines from an unknown source:

> "O God, for as much as without Thee
> We would not be enabled to doubt Thee,
> Give us power, by Thy grace,
> To convince the whole human race
> That they know very little about Thee."

There is some humility in these lines, a quality much too scarce in most religion. It would serve the world better if, now that modern knowledge has made the older face of God dim, we would give a profound reverence and faith to the creative spirit in life and forget theological doctrine.

With such an approach there is possible a natural and healthy mysticism employing the imagination and emotions through poetry, beauty, moral understanding, and the love of life. The older mysticism, the straining for contact with another world, with all its self-deceptions and personality disorders, has been thoroughly exposed by studies which psychologists have made. This type of mysticism has been a source of error and evil and should be replaced by normal and uplifting experiences of beauty and love.

An up-to-date religion must be rooted in a sound concept of truth. It must accept the validity of the method of science and begin with its findings. It must employ reason and experience wherever the complete testing methods of science are not possible. Not all truth can be scientifically tested, but no pretense at truth should be declared exempt from critical testing or from being related to the knowledge we have. Only by critical testing can religion be kept close to the realities of life. But religion is reluctant and jealous. Some of the most widely known theologians today are trying to belittle science. In doing so, they betray their fear of tested truth. They are trying to maintain a concept of truth which they believe comes through mysticism and revelation. Thus they keep religion behind the times. But what a release religion would find, and how vastly more effective it would become, if it should ally itself with the most valid forms of truth.

Further, it seems to me that an up-to-date religion will concern itself with the fulfillment of life here on earth. This will require a change, because most historic and current religion takes the position that, since this life is full of woe and is necessarily evil, we must transcend it or escape it to other-worldly life while we are in this one. A modern religion must teach that moral choices are worth-while for this life, that they are productive of good. It must teach that growth of spirit and mind is possible throughout life as a consequence of living it seriously and constructively. It must teach that love has content in human relations, that it contains respect for and understanding of people. And for the fulfillment of life, religion must be an agency to establish courage in the lives of people. This we should assume to be one of the most important of the current tasks of religion, and it illustrates well the practical value of an up-to-date religion in its effort for the fulfillment of life. At no time in the past has courage for living been so needed as today. In this situation there are only two attitudes to take. One is avoidance and escape. The other, the achievement of courage to face the realities and truths of life.

Courage is seldom, if ever, a gift. Most people are not born with it. It is partly mysterious, but we can understand that belief in values builds it. We learned in the war that soldiers who understood what they were fighting for, who believed in values they were defending, had the most courage. We know that young men without money, who believe in the value of education, have greater courage to make their way. We know that people can start again after defeat if they still hold values. Now, it is one of the great functions of religion to attach peoples' emotions and loyalties to great values. In doing this it can reinforce their courage.

The other great source of courage is practice. The old adage, "If at first you don't succeed, try and try again," doubtless gained currency from the experience that courage comes from trying and trying again. From this and the teachings of psychology we can see that a religion which encourages the facing of problems will ultimately also give courage. The task of religion, then, is to urge people to face realistically a torn and wrecked world, to face uncertainties that surround us, to face changed ways of living and the coming of new knowl-

edge—and now even to face the danger of mass extinction. The escape systems of religion must be left behind if the fulfillment of life through courage is to be achieved.

Another feature of an up-to-date religion must be a frank concern for social morality. Religion is learning much too slowly that social concern is its province. It has too long looked with disdain upon those few church members who rise up to speak of social wrongs, and upon ministers whose prophetic voices are bold. Religion that will not face its social tasks cannot save us. It must now undertake the systematic education of the social consciences of its people, and teach them ways to express their moral principles in life. It must join hands with the best secular forces in the fields of education, science, labor, business, and government. This task is pressing upon us urgently today and a modern religion must undertake it.

I have given what seem to me to be some of the most significant features of a modern religion — a religion that would be up to date. It is a religion of faith and reverence; of natural mysticism. It is a religion of truth, based on the kind of truth that science gives us. It is a religion of fulfillment in this life, fulfillment through love that has a content of respect and understanding for people, through the continuous growth of spirit and mind and through the creation of courage within the souls of people. It is a religion of social emphasis.

Such a religion is desperately needed. Mankind is sadly adrift in its convictions. Torn between the past and the present, people are not quite sure what they ought to believe. Confusion will continue unless this situation can be resolved. A believable religion is as essential to life as the heart is to the body. Our motivations must have a central source, and this source, to be effective, must be real, understandable and permanent.

There is a broad field for such a religion. There are many intelligent, influential people who have no home in religion. To them a bold and clear modern religion would come as a solid anchorage for a vessel adrift. I base this opinion not on theory alone, but on observation of what happens when churches offer such a religious approach.

If it were to operate extensively, a fully modern religion could be a great factor in bringing the rest of the world up to date. It would hearten the progressive forces that exist in other fields and the common bond of effort would move us far toward the solution of the world's most serious problems.

I am convinced that the approach which I have outlined would mean a new orientation for religion, changing fundamentally its objectives and content. If we help create a truly modern religion, our efforts will be closer to all the prophetic qualities of older religion, and we shall be of service to our time as well as to the future. This is a task for people who have embraced the tradition of free religion, a task for people of vision and courage. The courage we can create. The vision we can find. The will we must have or fail the future.

---

# Factories and the Church

EDMUND A. OPITZ

This is an age of faiths in dissolution. Political, economic, and religious beliefs that the previous generation held as little less durable than the earth itself have vanished as though they had never been. The space thus left by each retreating faith is filled with its seven relatives, for nature abhors a vacuum and we are a superstitious people. But there is one faith that has not so suffered; its citadel has not even been stormed. That is our faith in the factory system as such, our faith in the benevolence of industrialism in proper hands. A difference of opinion exists over precisely whose hands shall be considered proper: Shall they be the hands of an "enterpriser," of a "manager," or those of a state official? But the faith itself has not been successfully challenged either by logic, or by events which often possess a logic of their own. In this respect it is unique among faiths of today. Men are not clinging to it to prevent it from being swept away, they are building upon it as an irrefragable premise. Social planners have advocated remaking the state on the model of the factory.

The factory is so inevitable a part of our landscape that a diagnostic probe of it smacks of irreverence toward the universe. Who is so great as to disagree with nature? A critic of industrialism is hard put to find an audience, for the subject has not yet presented a problem to most men. It represents a smooth, shiny, surface to which criticism does not readily cling. One who suggests that industrialism, even in the best hands, does present a problem, is met with condescending smiles. His auditor assumes gratuitously that such a critic advocates the destruction of all factories and the abolition of all machines. Thus it becomes necessary at the outset to state that a criticism of industrialism does not entail that one destroy his lawnmower and crop the grass with his teeth. The critic of the factory system favors more efficient machines and he would keep the factory in our culture, but he would shift the accent and question the efficiency of great size. He would shift the accent from large scale mass production to small scale home and community production of all goods that can be made cheaper and of better quality by handicraft methods. That such a shift might be substantial, if fully carried out, is indicated by the estimate of a competent economist, Ralph Borsodi, that over 60 per cent of the things we consume could be made better and more cheaply on a small scale. This estimate is premised on full electrification, efficient household machines, and good human material as the most important element of all. If there existed a political party dedicated to effecting this transformation, it would be the only really revolutionary party. But by its very nature, such a change could not be inaugurated by political action; the people to whom it would appeal are not the types easily organized into mobs. Factory production is here to stay, dehumanizing as much factory work is. The situation would be eased, however, if a significant body of citizens made themselves independent of the factory system. There is no ground here for mass action; individuals and small groups would take the first steps under their own initiative.

The crux of factory production is that the employee

performs actions which are of decreasing interest to him as the division of labor and process is extended. What he does during his eight hours bears no vital relation to his intimate values. His job may require a high degree of skill, but often this skill is specialized out of all recognition to the total process. All-round skill is not required even though fragmentary adeptness is developed. The hand becomes glib without the brain, or vice versa. The latent capacities in man which delight in fashioning a thing of beauty and usefulness from raw materials, the passion to impose his will on something and shape it according to his vision—these things are thwarted and blunted. These are powerful instincts in man, and they are repressed. Twisted instincts will have their revenge. The situation calls for an Adler or a Freud. Much could be made of an analysis of what factory work does to individual men and women, and what they do after hours to rid themselves of its blighting effects.

It is generally agreed that factory work is not done for the love of it, but for the money in it. The theory is that one boots himself through eight hours in order to get the wherewithal to do what he really wants to do with the rest of his time. Open to serious objections in theory, in practice it is found that the worker is too tired and dulled to have any real wants, and drifts into diversions as fragmentary, repetitious, and brainless as his work. Doing the job and then getting rid of its effects leaves little room for other activities.

Is it any wonder that men whose daily lives have no implications that can be made explicit by the Church take no interest in the institution? Where there is nominal affiliation, it is more often with one or the other of two types of churches; those dispensing routine sacramentalism, or the "exciting" church composed of a curious mixture of bingo, ballyhoo, and bean suppers.

It is true that millions who are factory-employed at good wages feel no acute sense of deprivation at the thwarting of their instincts of craftsmanship. They are reasonably content with their jobs. But there are thousands who are slightly more sensitive, who possess intimations of capacities in themselves of which industrialism takes no account, and who feel that their wages are earned by a species of prostitution. This group is numerically significant, and it is trapped. It has no alternative but that of selling its work for wages, or starving. That is to say, no other way of gaining a livelihood is giving industry any real competition so far as this group is concerned. The task is to open up other avenues for the group that feels itself stifled in the stereotyped occupations open to them.

When industrialism came upon the scene in England, it found raw material for labor in the masses herded into a few cities. The once free English peasantry had been driven off the land by a series of Enclosures Acts, some three thousand in number, beginning in the sixteenth century. The result was to remove land from competition with industry in the labor market and to force down wages by creating a standing labor surplus. The legal pre-emption of land created a propertyless, poverty-stricken mass which would work for a pittance in the new factories. Benjamin Franklin perceived this situation clearly when he wrote:

> Manufactures are founded in poverty. It is the number of poor without land in a country, and who must work for others at low wages or starve, that enables enterprisers to carry on a manufacture. . . . But no man who can have a piece of land of his own, sufficient by his labor to subsist his family in plenty, is poor enough to work for a master.

Thomas Jefferson felt much the same way:

> Generally speaking, the proportion which the aggregate of the other classes of citizens bears in any State to that of its husbandmen, is the proportion of its unsound to its sound parts, and is a good enough barometer to measure its degree of corruption. While we have a land to labor, then, let us never wish to see our citizens occupied at a workbench, or twirling a distaff. . . . For the operations of manufacture, let our workshops remain in Europe. The mobs of the great cities add just so much to the support of pure government, as sores do to the strength of the human body.

At the time Franklin and Jefferson penned these lines, some 70 per cent of our people were free men, owning their own land, practicing their own craft or trade, self-supporting and independent. Today, some 70 per cent of the populace have no resources of their own, no means of support except the sale of their mental and manual labor in a market at the saturation point and beyond. They are dependent on an industrial system to supply them with jobs, or they are dependent upon the state to provide employment if industry cannot absorb them. Dependency is the soil in which exploitation grows, and it matters not whose hands guide industry or the state; where there is dependency there is exploitation guided pretty much by the degree of dependency.

Two forces are rushing us to an impasse: technological advance is steadily reducing the number of workers needed to produce all the goods industry can market, and the number of men and women who want work is steadily increasing. A next step after the impasse suggests itself: restore property for a significant number of people, giving them an outlet upon the land.

> Not much is needed: a small well-preserved homestead, a worthy craft reputably practiced, a tiny garden bearing evidence of cultivation by loving hands, a few books or reproductions of classical art. The point is that these objects should be transformed into a personal world, should bear the stamp of the owner's personality. True possessions are soul, and only through that soul culture.

These words are Spengler's, although his use of them is not in a precisely similar context.

It is a hazardous guess to say what percentage of our citizens must needs make themselves independent of both industry and the state before they would set the tone of our society. Ralph Adams Cram sets the figure at 60 per cent. "The firm foundation of a democracy is at least 60 per cent of the people living on land that they own, and from this land, plus subsidiary craft and shop work, also individually or communally owned." That such a percentage of men settling back into nature's rhythms, establishing a bond with the soil, and working at what gives their creative instincts full play, would change the tone of our society, scarcely anyone will deny. Work would take on a new meaning or, rather, an old one; the idea of work as prayer, *laborare est orare*. Phrase this naturalistically if you prefer. Men living this kind of life are intimates of the earth, aware of their own relationship to its living forces; aware, too, of its dark mysteries. Their existence has implications and overtones which demand to be made explicit by an institution whose concern is with man and his place in the total scheme of things.

Even if 70 percent of our population were possessed of a strong desire to go on to a life of independence on the land, the step would not be without its complica-

tions. But there seems to be no such desire among even 7 per cent; the instinct for property and craftsmanship seems almost completely overgrown. One observer, Leo M. Cherne, thinks it will decrease even more: "The freezing of property and ownership by giant enterprise will inevitably cancel out the basic aspiration of the middle class—the desire for ownership."

For those equipped to take this step, however, it possesses advantages over other possible forms of social action; one can take the step singly or with a small group, and he does not need to win an election to get started. The benefit to those who make the change will be direct: the work of their hands will not be the sort that puts the mind to sleep, its variety will develop symmetry, poise, and balance; it will be adjusted to organic rhythms. Others will benefit indirectly by the easing of the labor market. Men who desire to work for wages will have a bargaining power they do not now possess, and can hardly hope to capture by the only means now open to them, labor unionism. Industrialism will tend to find the place in our society which its own specific gravity assigns to it. At present, and since its inception, industry has been artificially buoyed up by state support. The prop which holds it up above its natural level is the legal pre-emption of land. Good land would never be withheld from those who need it were it not for the coercive power of the state. The police state is the linchpin which holds each of the three factors in its place: industry above, people below, and land off to one side.

The fact that the Church was a powerful influence in our national and cultural life during the period when a majority of our people were free craftsmen, creates a strong presumption in favor of the view that a restoration of that kind of life would *pari passu* restore the Church. It might be a Church as different from the old as an electric motor differs from a foot pump; but it would be an institution confronting those problems which are eternal and forever new, and dealing with a type of man for whom these exist as problems. It can be stated categorically that the present factory system does not produce material for the Church—with the two possible exceptions noted earlier.

It may be argued that the pattern of social change herein outlined is bad, false to human beings. Such a challenge can be met with counterarguments and facts. But a far more common reaction will be to regard this as a beautiful theory, quite unfit for modern consumption. The Church would be foolish to sponsor what has no chance of winning. Far better any kind of opposition than this nerveless cant! "Is the scheme right and good for men?" is the question for churchmen, not "will it win out next Tuesday?" The quality of its output counts, not the Church's subserviency to transient contemporary thought. It might do well to become "the home of lost causes, and forsaken beliefs, and unpopular names, and impossible loyalties."

---

# The Study Table

### One Girl Helps Make a United America

AMERICAN DAUGHTER. *By Era Bell Thompson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 301 pp. $3.00.*

If you think the "American Dream" is not coming true any more, you ought to read the new book, *American Daughter.*

It is a true story and goes like this. A little girl wanted to become an author. She did.

I heard Governor McMullen of Delaware tell one time about a little girl who had written him a letter. How she thought the Governor could help her, I do not know. But she wrote him to say that she wanted to become an author.

The Governor, with his customary thoughtfulness, answered the little lady's letter. He told her to keep right on working and some day she would be a great author.

At the time, this advice seemed almost too simple. But it really is not. Not in America.

One proof of this is Era Bell Thompson and her first book—*American Daughter.* She had less chance than most girls of fulfilling her ambition.

In this first book she tells the story of her life, a Negro girl growing up in the United States. Her story begins in a town in Iowa and goes on to North Dakota. This part of the story is told with infectious humor even in the face of the painful hardships that Era Bell Thompson and her family encountered.

The chapters that tell of her struggles to get a college degree were of particular interest to me, because the Richard Riley, Methodist preacher and finally college president, whom Miss Thompson describes so aptly, is my brother.

My brother, whose real name is of course not Riley, but O'Brian, took Miss Thompson into his home, where she lived, doing her share of the housework while she went to college.

I assure you that this new author did a first class job of describing my brother. His "Hallowe'en party to end all Hallowe'en parties" is worth reading about.

This book is written in the best spirit of America. It is far more than entertainment, although it is full of fun and enjoyment. It will live because it is a rare contribution to the basic understandings, between peoples, upon which America was built.

Era Bell Thompson's "search for friends among both Negroes and whites brought growing awareness of the common problems of minorities. She faced prejudices, watched hatreds simmer beneath the surface and flare into riots, but she found that there are people to whom qualities of friendliness and goodness are more important than differences in color or race."

*American Daughter* ends on a note of faith and optimism that all Americans ought to ponder. Says Miss Thompson, from her desk in Chicago, "the employer at the other end of the phone says, 'I like you; I like the way you talk. You sound like a real American Girl.'

"Then I know there is still good in the world, that, way down underneath, most Americans are fair; that my people and your people can work together in peace and happiness if they but have the opportunity to know and understand each other.

"The chasm is growing narrower. When it closes, my feet shall be on a united America."

This life story is proof that one person, even one Negro girl, can help to build that united America.

DELOS O'BRIAN.

### A Weighty Pamphlet

SENSE AND NONSENSE ABOUT RACE. *By Ethel J. Alpenfels. New York: Friendship Press. 25 cents.*

This is only a pamphlet but it is worth its weight in gold. As Professor Brown of Scarritt College says in the Foreword, "Progress in the science of human relations waits on at least two things: knowledge and motivation. We cannot build a cooperative world on ignorance and error." Again, "In the field of physical science we have reached the Atomic Age. In the field of human relations we can scarcely put two and two together to make four."

This booklet will help all who read it to put two and two together and the answer will be four. Unless we can do that there is surely no hope for the world. As Dr. Arthur Compton, one of the greatest atomic scientists says, "We must learn to live as brothers or we shall not live at all."

Here are the facts as scientists know them. There are chapters on "The Problem, What Is Race?", "Race and Culture Are Not the Same," "Face the Facts." There are answers to such questions as: "What do you mean by culture?", "Is it true that races smell different from one another?", and "Is it true that all races have the same kind of blood?"

The race problem is the fundamental problem of our nation and of our world today, because it is interwoven with all the other problems. It is time we all knew the facts. Here they are in the briefest compass.

JAMES M. YARD.

---

### "The Pathway to a New World"

FLORENCE AYSCOUGH AND AMY LOWELL: CORRESPONDENCE OF A FRIENDSHIP. *Edited by Harley Farnsworth MacNair. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 289 pp. $3.75.*

This book is important for many reasons. First, it is a distinct contribution to American letters, throwing as it does much new light on the work of Amy Lowell and the Imagist movement in modern American literature. Interesting discussions of Ezra Pound have added importance in the light of recent decisions in regard to him. Some of these things Miss Lowell suspected. The letters to Harriet Monroe also reveal much. Another interesting sidelight is the attitude of Professor Irving Babbitt toward Miss Lowell's experiments in verse. But the most important personality who comes to life in these pages is Florence Ayscough who opened to Amy Lowell "the pathway to a new world." Miss Lowell had a flair for languages and cultures, and Florence Ayscough filled her waiting, outstretched cup. Second, this book should be required reading today when we are trying to understand and build good will toward other nations. Florence Ayscough, one of America's greatest Sinologues, spent her life as an ambassador of good will. Born in China, Mrs. Ayscough through her writings, lectures, and translations interpreted Chinese literature, art, and social ideals to America, to England, and to France. She was just the person whom Amy Lowell needed and fortunately became her only collaborator. Miss Lowell's intuition plus the sound scholarship of Mrs. Ayscough produced in 1921 the vivid *Fir-Flower Tablets,* which opened a new chapter in American appreciation of Chinese culture as well as Chinese letters. It is true that Witter Bynner was attempting a similar work and is still opening to us a new world of appreciation of things Chinese. Amy Lowell's opinion of Mr. Bynner is brought out fully. It is interesting to observe from the correspondence that Amy Lowell was a very difficult person and that Mrs. Ayscough was among the few who could work with her in complete harmony. This book should have a wide reading and a permanent place in the history of American letters.

C. A. HAWLEY.

---

### State of Poetry

BEYOND THE HILLS OF TIME. *By Irene K. Surenson. New York: Harbinger House. 45 pp. $1.50.*

THERE IS A SPIRIT. *By Kenneth Boulding. New York: Fellowship Publicatons. 26 pp. 75 cents.*

The state of religious poetry in the last few generations has been a disheartening spectacle. The prophetic and lyric voices such as we find in the psalmists and prophets of the Old Testament have not been with us. Especially has the Christian tradition been barren of strong poetry. In all my gleaning of the verse in religious periodicals, I do not remember finding one poem that stirred me or convinced me of strength. Our promising poets spurn traditional religious themes.

In fact, such religious poetry as we have has little if any more excellence than the trite verse of popular songs, the homely and threadbare moralisms of Edgar Guest, and the patriotic doggerel of the small town newspaper columns.

*Beyond the Hills of Time,* by Irene K. Surenson, does little more than come up to the mediocre average. It is about as good as the feeble verse of most of the hymns written in the last century. Her ideas are slight and always well-worn, her images are ordinary, literary in derivation, and uniformly unexciting. There is no evidence of intellectual and spiritual agony in her efforts, and none of the intensity and intuition for the exact word, the strict economy of true lyrical poetry. It is diffuse, facile, and trite.

*There Is a Spirit,* a collection of sonnets by Kenneth Boulding, is in all ways superior to the other volume here reviewed, but it, too, misses greatness by several degrees. It is, however, sincere and deep intellectually

---

### The Field

(*Continued from Page* 66)

universal obligation to work which must be accompanied by the opportunity for full employment. The sorry spectacle of idle machines, unemployed men, and unused material present in one place at the same time does not make sense. There is intelligence enough in the United States to bring man, material and machine together. It is thus that the necessary, the useful and the beautiful are produced.

To argue that planning means serfdom is to make ourselves ridiculous. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company plans. The Ford Motor Company plans. The railroads have realized the same necessity, and plan for the morrow. Are we to believe that planning is wise everywhere except in the Commonwealth itself? Are the people incapable of reaching democratic decision relative to fiscal policy, the development of natural resources, public health, national defense, and social security? Democracy rests upon an informed and moral electorate. So the forefathers planned an educational system. Our system of public education is a chief bulwark of freedom.

—*The Churchman.*

and emotionally. Fellowship Publications is to be congratulated on the format of the book.

These are poems designed as material for meditations. Gerald Heard in a Foreword says of them: "Skilled and fitting phrases—sentences so well shaped that they will bear much repetition and carry intellectual and emotional sense—are necessary for deep meditation. . . . Mr. Boulding's sonnets are then beautifully made spiritual exercises." The poems are based on an affirmation of faith by James Nayler, one of the early Quaker heroes, shortly before his death. Boulding expands Nayler's ideas and moral convictions into poetic form.

As sonnets they are competent, but as poetry they suffer from the intention behind their production. Boulding says they were written "partly as a purely personal act of meditation and devotion, but partly also in the hope that they may call the intention of others to the depths of truth in the passage which fathered them." Such didactic and expository intention gives them the character of a *tour de force*. As an expression of the mysticism of the Quaker movement, they are welcome and instructive. They are deeply theistic. A naturalistic Humanist, such as myself, would be a bit skeptical about attaining the mystical surety, the sense of oneness with a supreme spirit, that Boulding seeks. Boulding does not reach the poetic stature of such poets of religious mysticism as Donne and Herbert, but he is an honest, if sometimes uninspired, craftsman. Each man's work must be judged by the intention, and Boulding succeeds in doing what he set out to do, and with competency. The first of the sonnets is one of the best and most representative:

Can I, imprisoned, body-bounded, touch
The starry robe of God, and from my soul,
My tiny Part, reach forth to this great Whole,
And spread my Little to the infinite Much,
When Truth forever slips from out my clutch,
And what I take indeed, I do but dole
In cupfuls from a rimless ocean-bowl
That holds a million million million such?
And yet, some Thing that moves among the stars,
And holds the cosmos in a web of law,
Moves too in me: a hunger, a quick thaw
Of soul that liquefies the ancient bars,
As I, a member of creation, sing
The burning oneness binding everything.

KENNETH L. PATTON.

---

# Correspondence

### No Longer a Man's World

Editor of UNITY:

When Dr. Arthur H. Compton presented awards to Dr. Lise Meitner and Katherine Cornell, at a meeting of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Chicago on June 6, he opened his remarks by saying that this is no longer a man's world but that women are successfully assuming a share in the conduct of world affairs in fields of effort hitherto exclusively monopolized by men.

Those who know of Dr. Meitner's work in the development of atomic energy know that her idea was, like that of Mme. Curie, that what evolved from her efforts would be used for the progress of mankind onward and upward, far removed from cruel, atavistic, destructive purposes.

All who were privileged to hear Dr. Meitner's response to Dr. Compton's citation must have felt a warm glow in their hearts as she repeatedly uttered phrases which attested her attitude toward the one overpowering problem of the world today —that of future universal peace—phrases which unmistakably came from her heart: "To make brotherhood a reality . . . improvement of human relationships . . .a just and lasting peace . . . what we need is action."

Truly indeed do we need action—action by women as much as by men here and everywhere. Practically a year has passed since the fighting ceased of a war whose cruelties were beyond description, and as yet no permanent peace is in sight for the world, not even domestic peace. On the contrary, men in various countries are still quarreling, and the men in power in industry in our country—both labor and management—delayed the reconversion so vitally needed to straighten out the tangled mess of affairs the world over and to bring relief to suffering peoples everywhere.

Is it not time, full time, for women to take over and start the needed action? That is what 81,000,000 women in 41 countries think who form the membership of the *Women's International Democratic Federation,* organized in Paris last November, one of whose objectives is "to bring about the establishment of a democratic and lasting peace." An American branch was organized in New York City on May 25, with 600 women attending from all parts of the United States, according to the *New York Times.* Dr. Gene Weltfish, Professor of Anthropology in Columbia University, was elected chairman.

France, where this Federation was organized, is a country where only lately the women have been given the vote but in whose Parliament women are already well represented. Britain and the United States should take notice. The women of France and other foreign countries know the horrors of war as we in America cannot possibly know them. And they intend with a determination that will not be sidetracked or suppressed to rid the world of that curse. Word comes from an authoritative source in Geneva that the great mass of working women in Germany are "passionately pacifist."

I believe the women's movement for world peace will be successful because the women will concentrate upon their objectives and no one delegate will allow her attention to be distracted by any desire to gain an advantage over other delegates for her own particular country.

I believe the women will open-mindedly discuss ways and means to merge their mutual interests and to share the substance of the earth to which all are heir. That is the women's spirit. Given authoritative positions in governments their pace toward peace would astonish the suspicious and tradition-bound men.

Coöperation is the key to success. No infantile exhibitionism of a desire for superiority over another but an honest desire for equal benefits for all will gain the goal. All other attempts are wasted energy.

The announcement of the offer, voiced by Mr. Baruch, to share the secret of the release of atomic energy with all other nations is a long step in the right direction. That wide-scale coöperation is essential to the successful maintenance of a world freed from domination by the threat and fear of war, and devoted to the pursuits of peace—goes without saying. This offer should do more to dispel the growing distrust between nations than any wordy assurances of friendship. It opens up an opportunity for the common people to let their governments know how strongly they favor the proposal and how deeply seated is their longing for a world whose nations live in amity; an opportunity for women to demand that men shall henceforth quell their arrogant desire for power and superiority and shall strive for the supremacy of reason and coöperation.

As the Editor of the *Boston Globe* has put it:

> The material power of the atom cannot become a blessing for mankind unless—as individuals and as nations—we realize and release the equally unlimited "atomic energy" of the soul, replacing the fission of fear with the cohesion of stability, the heat of hatred with the warmth of friendship, the death rays of envy and jealousy with the light of understanding and love.

*Brookline, Massachusetts.* LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

---

### That Alleged Indeterminacy "Principle"

To UNITY:

Prof. A. J. Bahm's article in May UNITY, "Arguing About Freedom," was most interesting and suggestive, but he takes the so-called Heisenberg Principle of Indeterminacy too seriously. It is not a principle, in the first place, and no physicist of distinction has been impressed by it. Prof. Max Planck, Prof. H. A. Levy of London University, and Prof. Bertrand Rus-

sell have pointed out that our inability to predict the dance of the electrons in the atom is due to the simple fact that our instruments are not delicate enough for the purpose. To infer that in a certain realm effects have no causes and phenomena no effects is a violent leap in the dark. Ignorance, as Professor Bahm says, cannot be erected into a principle.

The cosmos is governed by Law; the apparent exceptions to that principle may, ere long, be shown to be no exceptions at all. The last word about the electron has not been said by physics. Progress in that science is certain to continue, and Heisenberg has merely set it a problem. Some pious and credulous theologians imagine that the so-called indeterminacy principle strengthens religion and morality, but this is not the case. Their logic is faulty and their rejoicing premature.

Free will is a delusion. We *seem* to be free, because we cannot know at any given juncture which factor or consideration will prevail and determine our action. Human motives are mixed. There is conflict. That *some* cause does bring about our action in any situation is hardly debatable. If we desire to influence action—say, to reduce crime—we supply or reinforce a certain motive. That motive is often fear of punishment or substantial material benefit.

The philosophical Humanist is not worrying about morality. He knows that moral principles are based on human experience, knowledge, and evolved, civilized human nature.

*La Jolla, California.* VICTOR S. YARROS.

---

### Replying to Mr. Chworowsky

TO UNITY:

I would like to thank the Reverend Karl M. Chworowsky for his words of appreciation in the April issue of UNITY regarding my article of February on the Palestine question. May I also at this time reply in part to the questions raised by him: (1) as to whether any "Pope or any responsible 'official' of the heirarchy" has ever expressed himself favorably on the subject of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; and (2) as to how a million and a quarter or a million and a half European Jewish refugees could be accommodated in Palestine *now.*

My statement that "the Pope more than once has declared himself in behalf of the Jewish homeland" was based on very brief statements which I have at various times read but of which I have unfortunately kept no copy or source of reference, and which I have as yet been unable to find again. Until I am able to furnish more substantial evidence may I say I have just received the information, from someone who is in a position to know, that there are a number of instances "of the response of Popes Pius XI and XII to visiting Zionists of prominence, including Prof. Chaim Weizmann."

Regarding expressions of sympathy towards the Palestine question on the part of Catholic Church officials, may I refer Mr. Chworowsky to two illustrations.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service on February 14, 1944, sent out the following press release under the headine "Archbishop Deplores Closing of Palestine to Jewish Immigration:"

> *New Orleans, Feb.* 11.—The White Paper closing Palestine to the Jews should be abrogated or suspended, the Most Reverend Joseph F. Rummel, Archbishop of New Orleans, said in a published letter to Rabbi Emil W. Leipziger of the local White Paper Emergency Committee. Dr. Leipziger is Rabbi of Touro Synagogue Congregation.
>
> If the Jews needed protection in 1917 and the solace of a homeland in 1922, His Excellency said, they stand in greater need of help after all the sufferings endured in Europe, and Winston Churchill now has the opportunity to unmake what, in 1939, he criticized so vehemently in Parliament as the violation of a pledge. . . .

On January 30, 1946, Bishop Joseph E. McCarthy, Catholic Bishop of Portland, (Maine), issued a facsimile sermon and some literature on the Palestine problem, presumably for use by priests of the Bishopric. In a signed letter accompanying this material on Palestine, Bishop McCarthy stated:

> The need for the eradication of anti-Semitism is greater today than ever before. The establishment in Palestine of a homeland for the Jewish people will give them dignity and status and, hence, will elevate them in the eyes of non-Jews.
>
> I would appreciate it greatly if you would bring this message to your congregation on February 17 next. . . .

Photostatic copies of the letter by the Bishop of Portland, quoted above, are available at the Washington, D. C., office of the American Christian Palestine Committee, and a copy of the sermon distributed by the Bishop is on file there. The Reverend Mr. Chworowsky, I am glad to note, is himself a member of the Executive Committee of the Christian Council on Palestine, which is affiliated with the American Christian Palestine Committee.

In reply to Mr. Chworowsky's second question, as to how all the refugee Jews in Europe could be accommodated in Palestine *now,* may I point out first that I said "every one of the European Jews could be taken care of in Palestine now in temporary shelters *as rapidly as transportation is made available,* and until more permanent homes are provided for them." (Italics new). Of course the whole million and a quarter or million and a half cannot be transferred to Palestine in one day, or in one week, or even in one month. The problem of providing places for them *as they arrive* will therefore be less impossible than it seems, or than it would be if they all arrived at the same time.

Moreover, to those well-intentioned persons who are afraid that it would be cruel and heartless to transport over a million persons to little Palestine without elaborate provision for their care there, it can be said that in Palestine the homeless Jews will be far better provided for than they are now in the bombed-out and devastated lands of Europe where they are not wanted and where they do not want to remain.

The same food that is fed them where they are at present located, the same rations of clothing and other necessities—and perhaps even better rations of food and clothing, and so forth—can be given to them in Palestine. The future which awaits them in the Land of Israel will be far less cruel and far less heartless than was the fate of the six million who never returned from the Maideneks and Dachaus and Triblenkas. Surplus army tents, of which there is probably no shortage, and temporary barracks can be the roof over their heads for the time being, and the Palestinian soil will be softer for them to sleep on, and safer—even if enough beds or army cots may not immediately be available.

They will be happier than the two million or more men, women, and children from the Sudetenland now being uprooted from their homes in Czechoslovakia and dumped into Germany with little or no preparation for their care and (whatever their crimes may have been under the evil influence of Hitler) with little or no protest from a world that some day hopes to call itself *one.* They will be happier also and in better hands than the hundreds of thousands of Poles and Ukrainians and Letts and Lithuanians and other nationals who are now being forcibly "repatriated" to their homelands under communistic, dictatorial control.

In the early days of the War, when ten or eleven million persons in Russia and in neighboring states fled for their lives into the interior of the Soviet land to escape from the oncoming Nazi hordes, nobody in the Soviet Union barred the way for those refugees with the excuse that there was no room available or that enough provision had not yet been made for their reception. Why, then, should there be all this concern as to how the million and a half Jews will manage in Palestine?

To those who bring up the bugaboo of Arab-Jewish conflict, just as the Hindu-Moslem "conflict" has been raised time and again to deny self-rule and independence to the people of India, and as the "Moro problem" used to be raised in the Philippines not so many years ago, it can be said that there has been no "Moro" problem since an enlightened American administration recognized the right of the Filipinos to independence. In the same way there would long ago have been no need for conjuring up any religious problem in India if the people of that exploited land had been given sooner the right to plan their own destiny. And the Arab-Jewish-Sternist-Irgun problem would vanish into thin air with the advent of a free government for the Jewish people in their long-promised land.

To those who raise the question of a need for sending British and American soldiers to guard the Jews in Palestine, it can be said that the Jews will assume responsibility for their own—and perhaps even with the voluntary help on the part of many of the Arab population when once the British government has cleared out. In the words of an Arab newspaper writer in 1930, "the Arab People have not yet said their last word on the Arab-Jewish question. When this word has been said, it will not be one of hatred and war, but one of peace and brotherhood. . . ."

*Washington, D. C.* MIRIAM ZIONY.

# Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

## THE DENVER MEETINGS

The Western Unitarian Conference held its 1946 meetings in Denver, Colorado, May 31, June 1, and 2. It was attended by one of the largest and most representative groups in recent years. The program was one of outstanding excellence. There was genuine enthusiasm exhibited by all who participated in and attended the various sessions. Even the business sessions were well-attended and lively.

The Conference passed resolutions in support of the United Nations and condemning hemispheric or other regional blocs which might cause division within the United Nations. It also condemned the use of released time in the public schools for religious education and called for the immediate withdrawal of the special Presidential Envoy to the Vatican. A statement was adopted which pointed to the military, propaganda, and diplomatic activities that jeopardize the friendly relations of the United States and the Soviet Union and urged Unitarians to resist such activities and to work for Big Three unity upon which the larger unity of the world depends. A resolution was also passed calling for the ending of the war emergency.

Only two changes in the program as printed were necessary. Dr. E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis, gave the banquet address in the place of Mr. Hutton, and Mrs. Robert M. Birdsall, Detroit, spoke to the Alliance in the place of Mrs. Frank Frederick.

## ELECTIONS

The following officers and members of the Board of Directors were elected by the Conference:

President—Dr. Curtis W. Reese.
Treasurer—Mr. Delta I. Jarrett.
Board of Directors (Term—Four years):
Mrs. Florence Fifer Bohrer, Bloomington.
Mr. Nathan T. Ladenson, Evanston.
Rev. Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit.
Board of Directors — (Unexpired term — three years):
Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, St. Louis.

## OTHER BUSINESS

The Western Unitarian Conference is a corporation of the State of Illinois. Since the Illinois statute governing corporations not for profit has been revised it has become necessary to revise the by-laws of the Conference. The President was empowered to appoint a committee to recommend the needed changes to the next annual meeting.

## BOARD ACCEPTS APPEAL INVITATION

The Board of Directors meeting in Denver at the time of the Conference voted to accept the invitation of the United Unitarian Appeal to become a participating organization. The United Appeal has been set up as a separate corporation and will function on a full-time basis. The Conference has been cooperating with the Appeal since its founding as a voluntary group of organizations joining together for the purpose of raising funds.

We had hoped to be able at this time to give the facts and figures on what the Western Conference churches did on the United Appeal this past year, but they have not yet been received from headquarters. As soon as we receive them we will publish them.

## SUMMER & FALL READING

If you have not read these books, order them from the Conference Office.

1. *The Meaning of Humanism,* Curtis W. Reese. $1.00.
2. *If Thought Be Free,* E. Burdette Backus. $1.00.
3. *Peace of Mind,* Joshua Loth Liebman. $2.50.
4. *The Faith of an Unrepentant Liberal,* A. Powell Davies. $1.25.

We also have just received a supply of paper-bound copies of *Humanism States Its Case,* by J. A. C. Fagginer Auer; *If Thought Be Free,* by Dr. Backus is a collection of his radio addresses dealing with religion in the modern world.

To insure efficient and prompt delivery of your church school materials for fall, order them now through the Conference office.

## BORGFORD TO BEVERLY

Helgi I. S. Borgford, formerly minister of the Unitarian Church in Ottawa, Canada, began his new work as minister of the Beverly Unitarian Fellowship of Chicago on June 1. We are happy to welcome Mr. and Mrs. Borgford to the Western Unitarian Conference. Mr. Borgford is a graduate of Meadville Theological School.

## MR. HILTON'S APPOINTMENTS

May 5—Duluth.
May 12—Cincinnati (First Church).
May 19-24—Boston, May Meetings.
May 31-June 2—Denver, Western Conference.
June 14—Chicago Unitarian Council.
June 23—People's Liberal Church, Chicago.

From July 1 to August 15 Mr. Hilton can be reached directly at 514 Seventh Ave., S.W., Rochester, Minnesota; and from August 18-25 at College Camp, Wisconsin.

## GENEVA CONFERENCE

Advance registrations indicate that the Geneva Conference to be held at College Camp, Wisconsin, August 18 to 25, will break all records. This in spite of the fact that the programs were exceptionally late in getting out. Never before have the programs been ready for the printer so early and never so late in coming off the press. We are sorry that this was the case but there was nothing we could do about it.

Plans for the care and recreation of children four years and over are complete. We are still trying to make arrangements for nursery care for children under four.

If you have not sent in your reservation, do so now to Mrs. Lou H. Haycock, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15. There is still room for you. College Camp can accommodate more people than any other camp we have had heretofore.

**Summer Assembly—August 18 to 25—College Camp, Lake Geneva, Wisconsin**